



**LOUISVILLE JOURNAL**  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY  
RENTICE, HENDERSON, & OSBORNE,  
Green street, between Third and Fourth.

FOR PRESIDENT,  
**JOHN B. McCLELLAN,**  
OF NEW JERSEY.  
FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,  
**JOHN H. PENDLETON,**  
OF OHIO.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1864.

The proclamation of Governor Bramhall which we published in the Journal of yesterday was received the preceding night too late an hour for comment. But comment is unnecessary. The proclamation speaks for itself. The order of General Ewing, which we saw for the first time in the proclamation of the Governor, and which we are convinced the General issued without full consideration, is clearly one to which the Chief Magistrate of this Commonwealth, patient and long-suffering though he is, cannot be expected voluntarily to submit. He indeed could not submit thus, without dishonor. This does not appear to us to be a debatable matter. We hope that General Ewing, with the manliness and patriotic characteristic of the true soldier, will reconsider his order, and revoke it. We cannot doubt that he will. If he will not, we hope that his military inferiors will overrule his determination.

Meanwhile, we hope with equal earnestness that the whole master will be treated on all sides with the calmness and public spirit which the peace of the Commonwealth and the welfare of the Republic obviously and imperatively demand. We are sure that the master will be treated on the part of the authorities of the Commonwealth.

A FABRICATION DESTROYED.—The fiction respecting the Hon. George S. Boutwell, which has been in every Republican's mouth, turns out to have been first published by the Philadelphia Press, whose fidelity in stories of this class is somewhat notorious. The famous Woodward letter of General McClellan has been extorted by one of these stories in the columns of the same journal. Here is the fabric in question, as the Press originally stated it:

Hon. George S. Hillard, a Democrat, who voted against Mr. Lincoln in 1860 intends to vote for him in 1864. He was advertised to speak at a recent McClellan meeting, but did not make his appearance on the stand. His reasons were given as being compelled to do so, as he had recently made a friend to a friend, to be still a Democrat, and to differ from the present administration in certain respects, he did not care to do under the press. Administration they shall, if the grace of God comes back under it, I shall vote for Abraham Lincoln." These words will be echoed by thousands of Democrats who will support Douglass while he lives, and clinging to the imperishable principles of his stern patriotism.

Our readers will remember perhaps that we positively contradicted this story two other days. Subsequently we noticed in the Boston Post a like contradiction though somewhat less positive, which has drawn from Mr. Hillard himself the following note:

To the Editors of the Boston Post:

You are substantially correct in your comments upon the paragraph in the Philadelphia paper of Aug. 1, in which I never voted for him in 1860. It is true I voted in your column in 1860, but I did not do so for the sake of the Union. Nearly one dozen prominent Republi-

cans who have, the last ten days, taken down the name of Lincoln and run up that of Fremont, prominent Northern leaders are also doing the same. They are to join in the direction of the Democratic Union Association of the city, for the purpose of rallying the nomination of McClellan and Pendleton.

Admitting this to be true, however, the same thing in a much greater degree is true of the Republicans' devotion in favor of the conservative Democracy, under the leadership of McClellan. If the Republicans in large numbers are abandoning Lincoln for Fremont, as this crew says they are, in will larger numbers be abandoning Lincoln for McClellan. Whether they recognize the alternative to "Fremont or a copperhead" or Lincoln or a copperhead, they are evidently determined to choose the copperhead, under whose nickname they have the discernment to perceive every quality of head and heart that can inspire the hope of victory.

Will the Fremont men cry "Fremont or a copperhead" and equally in vain will the Lincoln men cry "Lincoln or a copperhead?"

The cry in either form is powerless to stay the popular movement in favor of McClellan.

The application of copperhead no longer has any terror even for the ignorant. For the intelligent it never had any.

They who invest their wife in the nickname do business upon extended capital.

Colonel Forney, the Editor of the Washington Chronicle, who has carried his unquestioning support of the Administration to such a degree that he is in some danger of going down toward posterity as Colonial Faneley, is nevertheless constrained to pay him a compliment.

I voted against Mr. Lincoln in 1860; so far the Philadelphia Press is right. I thought his election would be a great misfortune to the country, and I have certainly seen no reason to change that opinion. The Philadelphia Press is wrong in saying that I intend to vote for Mr. Lincoln in 1864, as I think his re-election would be an irreparable misfortune to the country.

I was invited to speak at the recent McClellan meeting in New York, and I told that I was advertised on the same platform as my antagonist, and that "last but not because of my absence was not because of want of interest in the object for which the meeting was called, for as you conjecture, I intended to act heartily in the Democratic Union Association." General McClellan (assuming that he would be the nominee of the Chicago Convention) to speak for Mr. Lincoln.

I never had had a "friend" the result of which was to put the Press into my mouth.

Never having been a Democrat, I could not have "claimed" to be one at all; and never having for a moment thought of voting for Mr. Lincoln, I could not have even thought such a purchase.

G. S. HILLARD.

Monday, August 29, 1864.

Thus the fabrication bursts into fragments and disappears.

But there is in the letter of Mr. Hillard a passage that rises above and reaches beyond the office of mere personal recollection. "As you say," Mr. Hillard observed, "I never was a Democrat, and never voted for Democratic electors of President in my life."

Political issues on which parties were formerly divided have become obsolete. We are living in a period of revolution. The old questions have passed away; and, though the old names survive, they are names merely, and no longer symbols." This language comes from one of the brightest stars of the Whig galaxy of which Webster and Choate and Winthrop and Everett were members.

The language is not merely patriotic but statesmanlike and philosophical. We accept it as the rationale of our own political action in this exigency; and we respectfully commend it to the attention of those Old-line Whigs, who, though almost persuaded to act likewise, still hesitate out of traditional regard to the Democratic party. This regeneration is natural. It is unavoidable.

We oppose this remarkable admission to the world and stupid perversions of some of Colonel Forney's political friends. And the opposition will be accepted on all hands as a triumphant refutation. It certainly ought to be.

Whatever may be said of the portion of the resolutions of the "Chicago Convention" which criticizes the Federal Administration, every party, including the Copperheads, has done its best, representing so large a portion of the American people, solemnly declare that the Union must be preserved.

The words in the resolution are expressive of what every honest man feels, and they now see that there is no party so contemptible in the free States as that which advocates peace on the basis of separation, and happiness as a people, and, as the friends of the Union, the cause of the slaves.

Colonel Forney is, however, a Democrat, and a few others have crept into the ranks of the Copperheads while he lived, and clinging to the imperishable principles of his stern patriotism.

On readers will remember perhaps that we positively contradicted this story two other days. Subsequently we noticed in the Boston Post a like contradiction though somewhat less positive, which has drawn from Mr. Hillard himself the following note:

To the Editors of the Boston Post:

You are substantially correct in your com-

ments upon the paragraph in the Philadelphia paper of Aug. 1, in which I never voted for him in 1860.

It is true I voted in your column in 1860, so far the Philadelphia Press is right. I thought his election would be a great misfortune to the country, and I have certainly seen no reason to change that opinion. The Philadelphia Press is wrong in saying that I intend to vote for Mr. Lincoln in 1864, as I think his re-election would be an irreparable misfortune to the country.

I was invited to speak at the recent McClellan meeting in New York, and I told that I was advertised on the same platform as my antagonist, and that "last but not because of my absence was not because of want of interest in the object for which the meeting was called, for as you conjecture, I intended to act heartily in the Democratic Union Association." General McClellan (assuming that he would be the nominee of the Chicago Convention) to speak for Mr. Lincoln.

I never had had a "friend" the result of which was to put the Press into my mouth.

Never having been a Democrat, I could not have "claimed" to be one at all; and never having for a moment thought of voting for Mr. Lincoln, I could not have even thought such a purchase.

G. S. HILLARD.

Monday, August 29, 1864.

Thus the fabrication bursts into fragments and disappears.

But there is in the letter of Mr. Hillard a passage that rises above and reaches beyond the office of mere personal recollection. "As you say," Mr. Hillard observed, "I never was a Democrat, and never voted for Democratic electors of President in my life."

Political issues on which parties were formerly divided have become obsolete. We are living in a period of revolution. The old questions have passed away; and, though the old names survive, they are names merely, and no longer symbols." This language comes from one of the brightest stars of the Whig galaxy of which Webster and Choate and Winthrop and Everett were members.

The language is not merely patriotic but statesmanlike and philosophical. We accept it as the rationale of our own political action in this exigency; and we respectfully commend it to the attention of those Old-line Whigs, who, though almost persuaded to act likewise, still hesitate out of traditional regard to the Democratic party. This regeneration is natural. It is unavoidable.

We oppose this remarkable admission to the world and stupid perversions of some of Colonel Forney's political friends. And the opposition will be accepted on all hands as a triumphant refutation. It certainly ought to be.

Whatever may be said of the portion of the "Chicago Convention" which criticizes the Federal Administration, every party, including the Copperheads, has done its best, representing so large a portion of the American people, solemnly declare that the Union must be preserved.

The words in the resolution are expressive of what every honest man feels, and they now see that there is no party so contemptible in the free States as that which advocates peace on the basis of separation, and happiness as a people, and, as the friends of the Union, the cause of the slaves.

Colonel Forney is, however, a Democrat, and a few others have crept into the ranks of the Copperheads while he lived, and clinging to the imperishable principles of his stern patriotism.

On readers will remember perhaps that we positively contradicted this story two other days. Subsequently we noticed in the Boston Post a like contradiction though somewhat less positive, which has drawn from Mr. Hillard himself the following note:

To the Editors of the Boston Post:

You are substantially correct in your com-

ments upon the paragraph in the Philadelphia paper of Aug. 1, in which I never voted for him in 1860.

It is true I voted in your column in 1860, so far the Philadelphia Press is right. I thought his election would be a great misfortune to the country, and I have certainly seen no reason to change that opinion. The Philadelphia Press is wrong in saying that I intend to vote for Mr. Lincoln in 1864, as I think his re-election would be an irreparable misfortune to the country.

I was invited to speak at the recent McClellan meeting in New York, and I told that I was advertised on the same platform as my antagonist, and that "last but not because of my absence was not because of want of interest in the object for which the meeting was called, for as you conjecture, I intended to act heartily in the Democratic Union Association." General McClellan (assuming that he would be the nominee of the Chicago Convention) to speak for Mr. Lincoln.

I never had had a "friend" the result of which was to put the Press into my mouth.

Never having been a Democrat, I could not have "claimed" to be one at all; and never having for a moment thought of voting for Mr. Lincoln, I could not have even thought such a purchase.

G. S. HILLARD.

Monday, August 29, 1864.

Thus the fabrication bursts into fragments and disappears.

But there is in the letter of Mr. Hillard a passage that rises above and reaches beyond the office of mere personal recollection. "As you say," Mr. Hillard observed, "I never was a Democrat, and never voted for Democratic electors of President in my life."

Political issues on which parties were formerly divided have become obsolete. We are living in a period of revolution. The old questions have passed away; and, though the old names survive, they are names merely, and no longer symbols." This language comes from one of the brightest stars of the Whig galaxy of which Webster and Choate and Winthrop and Everett were members.

The language is not merely patriotic but statesmanlike and philosophical. We accept it as the rationale of our own political action in this exigency; and we respectfully commend it to the attention of those Old-line Whigs, who, though almost persuaded to act likewise, still hesitate out of traditional regard to the Democratic party. This regeneration is natural. It is unavoidable.

We oppose this remarkable admission to the world and stupid perversions of some of Colonel Forney's political friends. And the opposition will be accepted on all hands as a triumphant refutation. It certainly ought to be.

Whatever may be said of the portion of the "Chicago Convention" which criticizes the Federal Administration, every party, including the Copperheads, has done its best, representing so large a portion of the American people, solemnly declare that the Union must be preserved.

The words in the resolution are expressive of what every honest man feels, and they now see that there is no party so contemptible in the free States as that which advocates peace on the basis of separation, and happiness as a people, and, as the friends of the Union, the cause of the slaves.

Colonel Forney is, however, a Democrat, and a few others have crept into the ranks of the Copperheads while he lived, and clinging to the imperishable principles of his stern patriotism.

On readers will remember perhaps that we positively contradicted this story two other days. Subsequently we noticed in the Boston Post a like contradiction though somewhat less positive, which has drawn from Mr. Hillard himself the following note:

To the Editors of the Boston Post:

You are substantially correct in your com-

ments upon the paragraph in the Philadelphia paper of Aug. 1, in which I never voted for him in 1860.

It is true I voted in your column in 1860, so far the Philadelphia Press is right. I thought his election would be a great misfortune to the country, and I have certainly seen no reason to change that opinion. The Philadelphia Press is wrong in saying that I intend to vote for Mr. Lincoln in 1864, as I think his re-election would be an irreparable misfortune to the country.

I was invited to speak at the recent McClellan meeting in New York, and I told that I was advertised on the same platform as my antagonist, and that "last but not because of my absence was not because of want of interest in the object for which the meeting was called, for as you conjecture, I intended to act heartily in the Democratic Union Association." General McClellan (assuming that he would be the nominee of the Chicago Convention) to speak for Mr. Lincoln.

I never had had a "friend" the result of which was to put the Press into my mouth.

Never having been a Democrat, I could not have "claimed" to be one at all; and never having for a moment thought of voting for Mr. Lincoln, I could not have even thought such a purchase.

G. S. HILLARD.

Monday, August 29, 1864.

Thus the fabrication bursts into fragments and disappears.

But there is in the letter of Mr. Hillard a passage that rises above and reaches beyond the office of mere personal recollection. "As you say," Mr. Hillard observed, "I never was a Democrat, and never voted for Democratic electors of President in my life."

Political issues on which parties were formerly divided have become obsolete. We are living in a period of revolution. The old questions have passed away; and, though the old names survive, they are names merely, and no longer symbols." This language comes from one of the brightest stars of the Whig galaxy of which Webster and Choate and Winthrop and Everett were members.

The language is not merely patriotic but statesmanlike and philosophical. We accept it as the rationale of our own political action in this exigency; and we respectfully commend it to the attention of those Old-line Whigs, who, though almost persuaded to act likewise, still hesitate out of traditional regard to the Democratic party. This regeneration is natural. It is unavoidable.

We oppose this remarkable admission to the world and stupid perversions of some of Colonel Forney's political friends. And the opposition will be accepted on all hands as a triumphant refutation. It certainly ought to be.

Whatever may be said of the portion of the "Chicago Convention" which criticizes the Federal Administration, every party, including the Copperheads, has done its best, representing so large a portion of the American people, solemnly declare that the Union must be preserved.

The words in the resolution are expressive of what every honest man feels, and they now see that there is no party so contemptible in the free States as that which advocates peace on the basis of separation, and happiness as a people, and, as the friends of the Union, the cause of the slaves.

Colonel Forney is, however, a Democrat, and a few others have crept into the ranks of the Copperheads while he lived, and clinging to the imperishable principles of his stern patriotism.

On readers will remember perhaps that we positively contradicted this story two other days. Subsequently we noticed in the Boston Post a like contradiction though somewhat less positive, which has drawn from Mr. Hillard himself the following note:

To the Editors of the Boston Post:

You are substantially correct in your com-

ments upon the paragraph in the Philadelphia paper of Aug. 1, in which I never voted for him in 1860.

It is true I voted in your column in 1860, so far the Philadelphia Press is right. I thought his election would be a great misfortune to the country, and I have certainly seen no reason to change that opinion. The Philadelphia Press is wrong in saying that I intend to vote for Mr. Lincoln in 1864, as I think his re-election would be an irreparable misfortune to the country.

I was invited to speak at the recent McClellan meeting in New York, and I told that I was advertised on the same platform as my antagonist, and that "last but not because of my absence was not because of want of interest in the object for which the meeting was called, for as you conjecture, I intended to act heartily in the Democratic Union Association." General McClellan (assuming that he would be the nominee of the Chicago Convention) to speak for Mr. Lincoln.

I never had had a "friend" the result of which was to put the Press into my mouth.

Never having been a Democrat, I could not have "claimed" to be one at all; and never having for a moment thought of voting for Mr. Lincoln, I could not have even thought such a purchase.

G. S. HILLARD.

Monday, August 29, 1864.

Thus the fabrication bursts into fragments and disappears.

But there is in the letter of Mr. Hillard a passage that rises above and reaches beyond the office of mere personal recollection. "As you say," Mr. Hillard observed, "I never was a Democrat, and never voted for Democratic electors of President in my life."

Political issues on which parties were formerly divided have become obsolete. We are living in a period of revolution. The old questions have passed away; and, though the old names survive, they are names merely, and no longer symbols." This language comes from one of the brightest stars of the Whig galaxy of which Webster and Choate and Winthrop and Everett were members.

</div



## LOUISVILLE JOURNAL

[For the Louisville Sunday Journal.]  
OLD MEMORIES.  
(Enclosed in E. L. S. of Texas.)  
ET C. R.

Old memories cluster round my head  
At ev'ry turn nature shuns to rest,  
And makes me feel the bright  
With the silent West,  
When ev'ry lone star is smiling down  
On peaceful land and sea,  
My heart, my heart, on! dearest friend,  
Then fondly turns to thee.  
  
For I have seen thy face,  
Still to me 'tis the same;  
Thoughts of thy love yet thrill my heart  
As with electric flame.  
The words of hope—so full of grace—  
Made me trust in man,  
And when I was dearest friend,  
Gives peace and holy rest.  
  
And now thoughts throng my heart—  
I dream sweet dreams of thee—  
And wonder, in my lonely hours,  
If ever you think of me;  
Oh! friend, "I fear not man!"—  
I blesss them with fond confiding love,  
And deem thee ever dear.  
Louisville, KY., August 16.

(For the Louisville Sunday Journal.)  
SHAKER SERMON No. 11.  
BY E. L. EADES, SHAKER UNION, KENTUCKY,  
AUGUST 25, 1864.

I am well aware that I have spoken some hard things, and even harsh things, but I am not unconscious of having spoken anything that is true; nor am I sensible of having uttered one word out of ill-will or ill-will toward any mortal, living or dead. All I have said or intend to say has been, and shall be, leveled at *principles*, not persons; but for persons holding principles which I see to assist, I feel it as an advocate of simple truth, I see no way to avoid it. I would prefer it if I could.

It is said that my blunt manner of speech is offensive to the refined taste of the more cultured part of the society; as if, lo! I must beg their charity, as I am but a "plain cloth man," and am not able to convey my ideas with that mellifluous euphony and oily sweetnes to which some of you may have been accustomed to listen. To present truth, unvarnished, understandable truth, being as my main object, I cannot take time to polish phrase, were I able to do so, although I should be happy to please you, like. Innumerable falsehoods are covered by much learning and a basely wrought phraseology, of which Locke thus discourses: "All artificial and figurative applications of words that eloquently have invented are for nothing else but to insinuate wrong ideas, move the passions, and thereby mislead the judgment. It is evident how much men love to deceive and be deceived, since rhetoricians that powerful instrument of error and deceit, has its established professors." \* \* \* It is to fence against the entanglements of equivocal words and the great art of sophistry that lie in them, that distinctions have been multiplied, and their use thought necessary. \* \* \* But it is not the right way to knowledge to hant after and fit the head with abundance of artificial and scholastic distinction. \* \* \* For in things crumpled into dust, it is vain to affect or pretend order, or expect clearness.

Words being intended for signs of my ideas to make them known to others, it is plain cheat and abuse when I make them stand sometimes for one thing, and sometimes for another; the wilful doing whereof can be imputed to nothing but gross folly or greater dishonesty. \* \* \* They who would advance in knowledge, and not deceive themselves with a little articulated air, should lay down this as a fundamental rule: not to take words for things, nor suppose them to stand for real entities till they frame some clear and distinct Ideas of those entities. \* \* \* When men have clear conception, they can, if they are ever so obscure and abstracted, explain them, and the terms they use for them. They can give us the ideas their words stand for, it is clear they have none."

It seems to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher, Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother. When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come. What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

Fifth—God hath sworn with an oath [to David] that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ!—Acts iii: 30. The question is, did God swear the man Jesus was the Christ, how is it that He could be seen by His disciples and not by the world? I answer: The disciples themselves saw the person of Jesus for some time before they saw the Christ; that is, before they saw that he was the Lord's anointed. Seeing the exterior, and comprehending the character, mission, or office, are very distinct—so that there were a great many worlds in that day, who were even conversant with Jesus, who saw that he was the Christ; while the enlightened saw more—they also could perceive that he was the Lord's anointed. Christ—So it will be.

Fourth—I am asked, if there might not have been an element or essence from God contained in the person of Jesus, otherwise than the blood of Christ, which we must drink in order to have his life in us? May not this have been the Christ which the disciples saw, that the world could not see?

I answer, not at all: 1st. This element would have to be an entity—an intelligent something, commissioned of God for a special purpose before it could be called Christ. 2d.

If it were such entity, he must be subdivided for all to drink or swallow him (it) and this would destroy theinity.

Fifth—Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God had made (as he had sworn to do) this same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ! The Apostle Paul alleges "that this Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ."—Acts xviii: 3. And he further mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly shewing by the scriptural proofs, and not one hundred and twenty thousand they were put to shame, and were converted to the Christian religion.

It is equally disastrous to theological or religious controversy, even when both parties conscientiously believe they are defending the true faith; but some have even gone so far in their blind zeal as to think it justifiable even to tell wilful falsehoods in defense of their cause.

They write books, and when they find their own doctrine not so harmonious, they straightway tell you not to scrutinize its parts, but to look at the spirit of it, get the wind; and not frequently as concern the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.

It is evident to me that nothing can be more true than that these words of the pious philosopher,

Who has not noticed in forensic debates, where the opposing parties were of equal intellectual endowment, that by their eloquence and rhetorical flourish of words they would in this carry the minds of the audience from side to side like a leaf tossed in the wind; and not frequently so as conceal the truth or a lie? Dearly of you know what is meant by coming from the loins of a progenitor according to the flesh? If you don't, I would advise you to go home and ask your mother.

When you learn, you may then know how Christ came from the loins of David, for God not only said, but swore with an oath that Christ should so come.

What greater pride could the Almighty himself have taken than did the spirit through the inspired one to prevent our being ensnared with the lying schemes of Antichrist, and made to disbelieve these plain and positive declarations of Holy Writ.